

species. A, anterior end; B, posterior end; *a*, posterior ridge; *b*, anterior excavation of cardinal tooth of right valve, *b*; *a*+, posterior slope; *b*+, anterior ridge of cardinal tooth of left valve, *a*; *c*, umbonal ligament.

Fig. 4. Diagram exhibiting vertical section of the cardinal teeth of *Unio littoralis*. *a*, single tooth of right valve, *b*, clasped by the two teeth, *b*, of left valve, *a*. The remaining letters have the same references as in fig. 3.

Fig. 5. *Anthracosia acuta*, Sowerby. Cast, exhibiting adductor muscular impressions, *a*, *a*—scars of the anterior set of foot-retractors, *b*— and pallial line, *c*.

Fig. 6. *Anthracosia Smithii*? Brown. Testiferous specimen, exhibiting the cartilage, *a*.

Fig. 7. *Unio distortus*, Bean. Jurassic. Cast in Mr. Bean's Museum, exhibiting anterior adductor muscular impression, *a*—scars of the anterior set of foot-retractors, *b*—supplementary scar, *c*—and a portion of pallial line, *d*.

VII.—On the Genus *Assiminia*.

[WE have received a further communication on this subject from Mr. Clark, in reply to the observations of Dr. Gray in our last Number, which we must decline publishing, the question having been sufficiently discussed in our pages to enable the reader to form his own opinion on the matter in dispute. We cannot however, in fairness to our correspondent, refuse insertion to the two following paragraphs, which we trust will terminate the correspondence on this subject.—EDS.]

“With respect to the generic maxims propounded by Dr. Gray,” Mr. Clark observes—“I dissent from them,—and disagree with Dr. Gray’s restriction of the number of the species of a genus, except under more stringent conditions than he has stated. Dr. Gray’s comparison of *Assiminia* and *Truncatella* is decidedly incorrect, and I maintain the position that the so-called *Assiminia Grayana* is malacologically a well-marked *Truncatella*.”

“I would also draw attention to the unfair manner in which Dr. Gray has commented on some of my statements: there is a studied reticence in his observations on important points, the correlative incidents of which are passed over without that notice which would have supplied corrections and explanations. To give an instance: in these ‘Annals’ for October I observed that I was ‘not surprised that my logic should not find favour with one who considers that a genus must be restricted in the number of its species, *however similar these may be in every essential character.*’ Dr. Gray quietly suppresses every allusion to the words which I have marked in italics, probably from a fixed idea that essential characters are of no importance in the establishment of genera. If I am correct in this supposition, I must still decline to entertain the belief that such views are held by modern zoologists, notwithstanding Dr. Gray’s repeated assertion that such is the case.”